

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Nebraska Swine Reports

Animal Science Department

January 1999

Defining Swine Nutrient Requirements and Allowances—What do the Numbers Mean?

Phillip S. Miller

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, pmiller1@unl.edu

Austin Lewis

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, alewis2@unl.edu

Duane Reese

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, dreese1@unl.edu

Mike Brumm

University of Nebraska, mbrumm@hickorytech.net

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/coopext_swine



Part of the [Animal Sciences Commons](#)

Miller, Phillip S.; Lewis, Austin; Reese, Duane; and Brumm, Mike, "Defining Swine Nutrient Requirements and Allowances—What do the Numbers Mean?" (1999). *Nebraska Swine Reports*. 133.

https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/coopext_swine/133

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Animal Science Department at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Nebraska Swine Reports by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.



fed dietary FM (10 and 20 percent) from 190 pounds had a significant backfat reduction. None of the FM treatments reduced the backfat to the same depth as control gilts.

We acknowledge the lean percentage of these high lean gain pigs appears low. We checked the equation used in conjunction with TOBEC readings, and discussed the results with the packer, but did not find any reason to explain this observation. The lean percentage values in Table 4 are based on 5 percent added fat. They are surprisingly low, given the backfat measurements and visual appraisal at time of slaughter. The SW tended ($P = .07$) to affect the lean percentage. The control gilts had the highest lean percentage. Dietary FM did not improve the lean percentage of barrows to equal that of the control gilts in this study.

Barrows fed 20 percent FM from

80 pounds had similar average daily gain, average daily feed intake and energy intake as control gilts, but the daily lean gain and lean percentage were less than control gilts. An explanation for this situation is a reduction in daily digestible lysine intake. The reduction of digestible lysine intake may have limited the daily lean gain of the barrows. When compared to the barrows fed 10 percent FM from 190 pounds, the barrows fed 20 percent FM from 80 pounds had numerically more backfat and less carcass lean. This indicates that feeding 20 percent FM from 80 pounds may help manipulate the growth performance of barrows to resemble that of gilts, but the lean growth and carcass lean percentage will decrease if the dietary digestible lysine intake is not adjusted. These results suggest that feeding 10 percent FM during the late finishing phase and

adjusting dietary digestible lysine concentration to meet the maximum lean growth requirement may slow daily gain and improve carcass leanness of barrows.

Conclusion

Feather meal reduces barrows average daily gain and average daily feed intake. The dietary digestible lysine content should be adjusted to meet the maximum lean growth if FM is used to slow growth rate and improve carcass leanness of barrows.

¹Kuo-Wei Ssu is a graduate student, Phillip S. Miller is an associate professor, Department of Animal Science; Michael C. Brumm is a professor of Animal Science and an Extension swine specialist and Jill M. Heemstra was a technician at the Haskell Agriculture Laboratory, Concord, Nebr.

Defining Swine Nutrient Requirements and Allowances—What do the Numbers Mean?

Phillip S. Miller
Austin J. Lewis
Duane E. Reese
Michael C. Brumm¹

Summary and Implications

Defining nutrient requirements or allowances is the first, and conceivably most important step, in developing a nutrition program for growing-finishing pigs. Understanding the terminology and underlying principles used to define nutrient requirements and allowances for pigs will help producers better evaluate their nutrition programs. This information will also enable producers to interface production outputs (e.g., growth rate and carcass data) to published nutrient requirement and allowance programs,

such as The National Research Council, Nutrient Requirements of Swine, 1998. As these and other approaches describing nutrient requirements for pigs develop, producers need a better and more complete understanding of growth biology in order to help them accurately determine the nutritional needs of their pigs. Because of the diminishing-return response of growth and biological traits to nutrient intake or concentration, the added costs associated with increasing nutrient densities at or near the requirement must be carefully considered.

Introduction

Nutrient requirements/allowances are determined based on the response of biological or growth criteria to vary-

ing intakes or concentrations. These criteria vary according to the physiological state of the pig (i.e., growth, pregnancy or lactation) and the level of production (e.g., 1.5 versus 2.2 pounds weight gain/day). The objectives of this article are to review the general processes for development of nutrient requirements and allowances, to illustrate the differences between a nutrient requirement and allowance, and to discuss how maximizing a biological response may not maximize economic returns.

Performance Criteria

Nutrient requirements are rarely based on a single research experiment but most often derived from a variety of experiments. Conditions vary among




Figure 1. The response of growth to nutrient intake or concentration.




Figure 2. Representation of a nutrient requirement and allowance.

experiments or the production systems used to develop nutrient requirements and allowances. These conditions must be considered when determining a requirement or allowance's applicability. To establish a requirement or allowance, a production and/or biological criterion must be identified. Also, the criterion selected must vary (increase or decrease) according to the concentration of the nutrient of interest.

A common growth trait used to establish requirements or allowances for growing-finishing pigs is average daily gain (ADG). The response of ADG to nutrient (e.g., lysine) intake is curvilinear (increases linearly and reaches a plateau after the requirement has been observed, see Figure 1). Often, the response of the performance trait is represented by two linear lines (increase and plateau).

Nutrient Requirements Versus Allowances

Depending on the source or publication, either nutrient requirements or allowances will be presented. A **requirement is defined as the nutrient intake or concentration that maximizes the response criteria. An allowance is equivalent to the requirement plus an additional amount often called a margin of safety** (see Figure 2). The new National Research Council publication documenting swine nutrient needs is requirement-based (NRC, 1998, Tenth Revision, National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.), whereas the Nebraska and South Dakota Swine Nutrition Guide (Nebraska Cooperative Extension Publication 95-210) presents nutrient allowances. Generally, using nutrient allowances to formulate diets eliminates the possibility of under feeding a nutrient, a scenario more likely using nutrient requirements. The downside of using allowances is the potential for overfeeding a nutrient, which in the case of expensive ingredients, increases costs and decreases profit. In addition, dietary nutrient excesses will increase nutrient excretion, contributing to environmental problems.

Underlying Biological Processes

While performance criteria are useful in defining nutrient specifications, describing and measuring the underlying biological process(es) utilizing the nutrient are helpful in establishing the nutrient requirement. An example of this is in the NRC, 1998 *Nutrient Requirements of Swine*. In this publication, the driving force defining the lysine (and other dietary essential amino acids) requirements for growing-finishing pigs is the rate of muscle protein deposition, or simply, the rate of lean deposition (see Figure 3). The shape of the curve is assumed constant (unless indicated differently by the user) and is adjusted according to the average daily lean gain estimated by the user. If the

(Continued on next page)




Figure 3. The lean growth curve of a growing-finishing pig.




Figure 4. The relationship between average daily gain and the efficiency with which lysine is used for growth.

concentration of lysine in muscle protein is known and the proportion of dietary lysine absorbed and metabolized (not degraded or used for non-muscle functions) is estimated, the amount of dietary lysine required can be determined. Therefore, producers can utilize kill-sheet information listing the lean (muscle) percentage in their pigs, along with an estimate of initial lean percentage (estimated from the initial weight of pigs entering the growing-finishing facility), to apply to the model of lysine utilization developed by the NRC and estimate the lysine requirement.

Maximizing Growth versus Maximizing Profit

Because the response of growth traits follows a pattern of diminishing returns (see Figure 1), maximizing the response does not always define a nutrient concentration or intake that will maximize profit. As the requirement is approached, the efficiency (marginal efficiency) of utilizing the nutrient for a specific function (e.g., lean growth) decreases dramatically (Figure 4). Depending on the nutrient in question, the additional cost of increasing the concentration of a nutrient in the diet to increase growth or performance from 95 to 100 percent of maximum may be greater than the potential return. Studies at the University of Wisconsin demonstrated that formulating diets to maximize growth by adding supplemental dietary lysine can add as much as \$2.76/pig to the cost of producing a 240-pound pig with no or little benefit in growth rate and/or carcass quality.

Because producers must consider the diminishing return response, dietary nutrient intakes or concentrations should be scrutinized to ensure the nutrient is not being overfed relative to the potential economic return.

¹Phillip S. Miller is an associate professor, Austin J. Lewis is a professor, Duane E. Reese is associate professor and Extension swine specialist, Department of Animal Science and Mike C. Brumm is professor and Extension swine specialist at the Northeast Research and Extension Center, Concord, Nebr.